UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| Kathy Reaves, |) C/A No. 4:24-3418-JD-TER |
|--|----------------------------|
| Plaintiff, |) |
| vs. |) |
| Patrick Dean Blanchard, Charles Michael Dickens, |) ORDER |
| James A. Segars, Christopher N. Williamson, |) |
| Kenneth Phelps, South Carolina Highway Patrol, |) |
| Richardson Plowden, |) |
| Patrick L. Huff, Lisa Thomas, Lori Jenelle, |) |
| Director, South Carolina Dept of Public Safety, |) |
| Defendants. |) |
| |) |

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia transferred this case to this court, finding proper venue within this district, and may not have been aware of Plaintiff's pre-filing injunction order in this court. On January 25, 2024, the District of South Carolina district judge entered an order instituting a pre-filing injunction against Plaintiff as to actions within certain parameters. No. 4:23-cv-3847-JD (ECF No. 25). Plaintiff was ordered in the filing of any action:

Plaintiff must also pay the filing fee in full or obtain counsel to file new actions related to any event regarding the Georgia warrant and the 2021 South Carolina arrest in Marlboro County and its effect on Plaintiff's credit report and employment.

Further, Plaintiff is ORDERED to accompany any newly filed Complaint with a "Motion for Leave to File Pursuant to Court Order," which should not exceed twenty pages in length and shall be forwarded to the Magistrate Judge for determination as to whether leave to file shall be granted, and Plaintiff's Motion shall be accompanied by: (1) a copy of the district judge's pre-filing injunction Order; (2) a statement from Plaintiff that the claims or relief sought are unrelated to the subject matter prohibited as outlined above; (3) a short and plain statement setting forth a valid basis for the claims or relief sought; and (4) a statement that the claims or relief sought either have or have not been raised before in other litigation, and if the claims/relief have been previously raised, then Plaintiff must provide the name of the case, the court where it was filed, the case number, and the disposition of the claims. Failure to comply with any of these requirements will be grounds for the Court to deny a "Motion for Leave to File Pursuant to Court Order" submitted by Plaintiff.

Id. A review of Plaintiff's Complaint shows it is "related to any event regarding the Georgia warrant" and its effect; therefore, this action falls within the pre-filing injunction order's parameters and its requirements. Plaintiff must comply with the 2023 order in all respects as listed above. Failure to comply with any of these requirements by July 8, 2024, will result in a denial of leave to file in this court and a dismissal of the instant action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 14, 2024 Florence, South Carolina s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge